



DR. BERTIE WILKINSON, Professor Emeritus of History, with the Chairman of the Board, the Chancellor, and the President just before entering Convocation Hall and receiving an LL.D. degree at the second Fall Convocation.

Who will head U.C.? Jan 18 is last day for suggestions

The University College Search Committee, composed of representatives of the Teaching Staff, Students and Alumni of the College, and concerned with recommending to the President nominations for the position of Principal of University College, invites suggestions of names of persons, either within or outside the University of Toronto, for consideration by the Committee.

Nominations, with biographical information for persons who might not be known by members of the Committee, are required by January 18, 1970, and should be addressed to the Chairman of the Committee, J. H. Sword, Executive Vice-President (Academic) and Provost, University of Toronto, Simcoe Hall, Toronto 181.

A & S Council delays parity motion debate

Arts and Science Faculty Council at its January meeting on Monday postponed further discussion of the motion by Professors W. H. Nelson and J. M. Rist and the amendment thereto by Prof. F. F. Wilson on student-staff parity in University governance. After an hour and a half devoted to other business, Council agreed to a suggestion by Dean A. D. Allen that not sufficient time remained and the attendance (about 100) was not large enough to do justice to the subject. The motion and amendment will be dealt with at another meeting to be called before the next regular session.

PAC to recommend on new Dental Dean

A Presidential Advisory Committee has been established to recommend a successor to the Dean of Dentistry.

The Committee is composed of the following: Dean A. M. Fallis, Dean F. N. Hughes, Profs. A. M. Hunt, J. Kreutzer, J. E. Speck, A. T. Storey, J. S. Thompson, G. H. Beaton, and Dr. John Hamilton (chairman).

FORUM ON CUG

This new activity is in response to the CUG Programming Committee's call for a written debate on the CUG Report. The Committee invites members of the University Community, academic and non-academic, to submit *brief statements concerning any of the issues raised in the CUG Report*. These should be addressed to the Editor of the *Bulletin* or the Editor of *The Varsity*. Both periodicals are co-operating in the Committee's important effort to stimulate discussion. Material submitted to one paper will be made available to the other, unless the writer specifically requests that it appear in only one paper.

Claude Bissell

On December 2, I spoke to the annual meeting of the Association of the Teaching Staff. I talked about the Report of the Commission on University Government, and tried to place the Commission in its historical perspective, to analyze its structure, and to explain the nature of some of the controversial recommendations. My remarks were as follows:

After some weeks of intense discussion last fall, CUG emerged as essentially a parity committee. The original recommendation, which came from the President's Council to the Board of Governors, called for a commission that would have consisted of two members of the Board, two members of the staff, two students, two administrators and, possibly, a representative of the alumni. By joint action of the SAC and the ATS it was changed into a commission made up of four students and four staff. The original SAC proposal admitted the President to the discussions, but did not give him a vote. This was restored by staff action,

but two other members of the Board of Governors were not dealt with so magnanimously. The commission remained essentially a parity body, the President serving the role of a resource person of experience who would necessarily be involved in the implementation of CUG recommendations.

I think that the few people who came to the open meetings of CUG would say that it was conscientious and systematic. The commission spent the first two months establishing a working relationship, and letting off rhetorical steam. There were repeated crises, sometimes minor, sometimes major, and from time to time a possibility that the commission would collapse. The students were better prepared for parity discussions. They had been elected on a common platform which called for domination of the University by students and staff, and they were in a position to confer quickly with outside groups of sympathizers. The staff had no clear commitments, and they had

(See page 2, col. 1)

Formation of Association of Support Staff is urged

An estimated 400 secretaries, technicians, policemen, architects, engineers, maintenance workers, librarians and other members of the University's Support Staff answered the President's appeal for a good turnout at the Thursday, December 18, meeting on University government. To accommodate the large numbers, the venue was switched from the Debates Room of Hart House to the Auditorium of the new Medical Sciences building.

The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the report of the Commission on University Government and its impact on Support Staff. The meeting was chaired by Kenneth McEvoy, a member of the

executive of the Students' Administrative Council and of the Programming Committee of CUG. With him on the stage were D'Arcy Martin, a student member of CUG, Professor Bernard Etkin, a teaching staff member of CUG and Stephen Grant, a student member of CUG.

The first one-quarter of the two-hour meeting was taken up by discussion of a grievance between staff of a company which at the time was contractor for catering services in New College and a statement on behalf of the University by Robin Ross, Vice-President and Registrar. The University point of view, expressed by Mr. Ross, was that the cater-

Discipline: ten planning next steps

Five members of the teaching staff and five students—the Campbell Programming and Implementation Committee—are developing a program for discussion and implementation of recommendations contained in the report of the Presidential Advisory Committee on Disciplinary Procedures.

The report, made public last September, was the work of a committee established in February 1968 under the chairmanship of Prof. D. Ralph Campbell, Department of Political Economy, at that time Associate Dean of Arts and Science.

The Programming and Implementation Committee is meeting in open session every Wednesday from 11 a.m. to 1 p.m. in the Senate Chamber, Simcoe Hall. Its membership consists of the following representatives of four University constituencies:

Association of the Teaching Staff—Professors E. R. Alexander, Law; M. E. Charles, Chemical Engineering; J. E. Guillet, Chemistry; Trevor Lloyd, History; Stanley Schiff, Law.

Graduate Students' Union—Michael Vaughan, president, GSU.

Students' Administrative Council—Wayne Hankey, Michael Scherk, Peter Beyer.

Association of Part-time University Degree Students—Kurt Loeb.

In addition to Prof. Campbell, the members of the Committee on Disciplinary Procedures were: Charles L. Dubin, Q.C., alumnus; Dean James M. Ham, Applied Science and Engineering; Rev. J. M. Kelly, President, St. Michael's College; Prof. Arthur M. Kruger, Political Economy, secretary; Steven Langdon, 1969 president, SAC; Prof. Mary Laurence, Psychology; Rod O. MacDowell, student, Political Economy; Prof. S. P. Rosenbaum, English, Erindale College.

At the inaugural meeting of the Programming and Implementation Committee, Robin Ross, Vice-President and Registrar, who presided pending the election of a chairman, pointed out that the four groups from which the committee membership had been drawn had endorsed the format of the committee and that President Claude Bissell had approved its composition on their advice.

(See page 7, col. 1)

JANUARY 15 DEADLINE

University of Toronto Bulletin is published by Department of Information, Room 225, Simcoe Hall. All material for the next issue should be in the hands of the editor, Mrs. Winogene Ferguson (928-2102) by noon on the 15th of January.

ing staff at New College were employees of the contracting company and not of the University. Several speakers from the floor claimed that the matter was of vital interest to all present because, they asserted, it lay within the power of the University to contract out other services, now performed by Support Staff, such as janitorial services.

On a ruling from the chair which clearly enjoyed the support of the majority of those present, discussion then switched to the subject of the Commission's report. At this point, Mrs. Gwen Russell, School of Hygiene, rose to report that first steps had been taken, the

(See page 3, col. 2)

FORUM ON CUG

(Continued from page 1)

no easy means of conferring with their colleagues.

There were four powerful forces that made it imperative that such a commission should be established. The first was a general awareness in both Board and Senate of the deficiencies of the present system—the unrepresentative nature of the Board and the elephantiasis of the Senate. The second factor was the faculty's concern for participation in University government at the highest level. In the official ATS brief of August, 1966 the ATS asked for one-third of the places on the Board, these places to be gradually achieved over a number of years; and the ATS brief to the commission reiterated this request. The third consideration was an increasing concern among senior administrators for the awkwardness and inefficiency of the present system of divided responsibility or, as I dubbed it, of double innocence. Even more important than the separation of the financial and the academic were the difficulties encountered by the two senior bodies in dealing adequately with the major problems. These problems were (a) conditions of employment of staff; (b) the physical expansion of the University; (c) academic priorities; (d) the necessity to work out a judicial system in place of the traditional schoolboy concepts of discipline. All these areas demanded the bringing together of financial and academic factors; but, even more, they demanded consideration from members of the university community who were prepared to give a great deal of time to their consideration. The fourth, and perhaps the most explosive, factor was student power. Since 1960 there have been three discernible phases in the growth of student power. The first was characterized by a demand for financial autonomy which was gradually achieved after a number of concessions by the Board of Governors. The second was insistence upon openness in all deliberations, an openness which reached its climax in the affair of the so-called secret brief a year ago. The third phase is the insistence upon direct student participation in decision-making at all levels.

Student power in its more militant forms made universities aware that they no longer possessed a strong authoritative centre. The structure weakened when pressures were applied. The official bodies of the University found themselves increasingly unrelated to events and incapable of directing them.

The commission should be seen as this University's attempt to answer the questions raised by these forces. It was not an answer to immediate issues and passing events; it was the culminating stage in a historical process. If the commission had disintegrated, which at times seemed likely, or if it had produced a divided report, which seemed even more likely, we would have entered upon this crucial year with no basis for discussion, with not even a tentative answer to the many questions that confronted us.

The commission never thought of its recommendations as constituting a blueprint for immediate action. Under great pressure it worked out a number of compromises; these compromises must now be tested in a wider environment. In particular it is important that these compromises must now be examined with great care by the staff.

Almost all the discussions so far—and this will be true of most discussions for a long time to come—concern the top governing body and the structure of departments. In the discussions in CUG one could say that the staff were more concerned about the former, and the students about the latter. Indeed, the students were inclined to slight the question of the top structure, and to insist that the real issues were on the departmental level. It was only towards the end of the discussions that the students realized the unavoidable centrality of the Governing Council.

The concluding paragraph of the Report is a witness to this final illumination: "Achievement of a Governing Council with its attendant committees and secretariat, is an essential step

towards the realization of the new university community which we have envisioned in the earlier chapters of this Report. We hope that debate about such a council, and coalescence of a consensus within the University about its nature and structure, will take precedence in the discussions that follow on the recommendations we have presented above. With the establishment of a unicameral council representative of all estates, the University may proceed in an effective fashion to determine its will in regard to the other major questions we have dealt with in this Report."

The crucial section in the description of the powers of the Governing Council is Section L, which gives the Council the right "to delegate to any person or persons the power to make appointments to any office or position authorized by the Governing Council, except those of President, Chancellor, Dean, Director, Chairman of a department, or Secretary of the Governing Council". I doubt whether any Governing Council will willingly delegate these powers, at least not until it has examined the whole question of appointments, and has drawn up general guidelines for the direction of departments. The recommendations for departmental structure and, in particular, for appointments, promotions, and tenure will, I am sure, be a first order of business for any Governing Council. At that time the Governing Council will look at the recommendations of CUG in the light of the subsequent criticisms.

I would like to comment on the recommendations on appointments and departmental structure. During the discussions in the commission I sought advice from my colleagues about what I knew was going to be a crucial question. It was clear that there would be widespread acceptance for the presence of students on committees making administrative appointments. I am sure that no future appointment to a university Presidency will be made without participation by students up to the point of final recommendation. Once this proposition has been accepted it is difficult to draw the line between administrators down to and including the Chairman of a department. The second point that emerged in the discussions was that students should participate in the preliminary steps leading toward appointment and promotion, but should not be involved in a final decision. The universal comment was that members of staff should be finally judged by their peers. Technically the CUG recommendations leave the final decisions in these matters to the Chairman and the Dean, and therefore satisfy faculty conditions.

One should remember several ways in which the Report guards against some of the obvious dangers of student participation in appointments. It places great emphasis on qualifications for departmental citizenship, which are to be a subject for discussion between staff and students, and could be a means of greatly reducing the fear of an uninformed student majority. The commissioners had in mind here the experience at Simon Fraser where there was no specific qualification for student departmental citizenship, and where a student could move unchecked from one department to another. Another significant point was the provision for students and staff to divide into separate groups prior to the forwarding of recommendations to the Chairman or the Dean. This was done in deference to staff insistence that students should not discuss staff in the presence of staff colleagues.

The greatest criticism, I gather, is directed against recommendation (57), which enjoins parity and parallel negotiations in determining the composition of the departmental council. We must here, I think, distinguish between simple parity and complex parity. Simple parity involves an equal number of students and staff, with no representation from another estate and could, it is feared, lead to institutionalized confrontation. Complex parity is illustrated by the proposals for the Faculty Councils and the Governing Council, where a third and (in the Governing Council) a fourth

element is added, thereby reducing the possibility of a power struggle between two equal groups.

The concept of parity has succeeded openness as the key word in activist demands. The explanation commonly heard is that it gives students an assurance of emotional and psychological security. It is a procedural device and, to me, does not mean equality of status. I am unhappy that the term has been given such prominence; I would hope that there would be many committees in the University where parity would be consistently violated. But I am convinced that tokenism, provision for a small number either of students or staff on any committee or body, is unfortunate; it creates an embattled clique which is susceptible to outside manipulation.

The recommendations of the commission are democratic in spirit, but are certainly not democratic in any literal sense. The concept of estates has no place in any democracy, nor does the concept of parity. What the Report argues for is the open society where all the estates participate in decisions at various levels, where discussions in official bodies are open, where all decisions are made known as quickly as possible; and where, accordingly, there is a willing delegation of legislative powers to elected representatives, and of executive powers to responsible administrators. This does not seem to me to be anti-intellectual, as some critics have contended. I see no necessary connection between the intellectual life on the one hand, and the hierarchical, uncommunicative university on the other. The university must be faculty-directed, but not faculty-dominated, and the strength of its government must come from a union of faculty, students, and laymen. The student element in this alliance will be made up of a relatively small group, who are prepared to give time and thought to University affairs. Eventually this group may derive their strength from the majority of the student body, who will always be inactive, but can become concerned: it is greatly to the University's advantage to encourage such a development. If we repudiate the group of student activists who participated in and supported CUG—intelligent, idealistic, deeply concerned about the University—then we shall lose the entire student body to apathy and cynicism, and the activists will be supplanted by the apostles of incivility and brutality, who in these days wait expectantly in the wings.

CLAUDE BISSELL
President

★ ★ ★

G. F. D. Duff

G. F. D. DUFF
Chairman
Department of Mathematics

★ ★ ★

C. B. Macpherson

The strength of the case for a one-tier governing body for the whole university, as against any two-tier system—a case which I consider extremely strong—depends partly on the composition of the proposed single Governing Council. I shall argue that the composition of the governing body should be decided on grounds of the *function* the university is or should be expected to perform, rather than on analogies with either feudal or democratic political societies; and that, on grounds of aptness to perform that function, the faculty should have at least parity with all others together on the governing council.

The reasoning offered by CUG for its recommendation of 20 students, 20 faculty, 20 laymen, is surprisingly slight, and rather odd. The CUG case for the inclusion of 6 *ex officio* administrators is well made, and I do not question it. But why, for the rest, 20-20-20? The Report first plays down the importance of the whole question of proportions by speaking of any discussion of it as "the numbers game", then suggests that the numbers "in the final analysis" tend to be merely symbolic because the three groups are unlikely to vote as blocs. I find this unconvincing. Is it not quite likely that the student and faculty groups would on some crucial issues vote as blocs? The Report itself does a good deal to encourage them to act as blocs at lower levels, and the Commission's own deliberations appear to have been conducted with a steady consciousness of the blocs in its own membership. Numbers, we may conclude, are important enough to require more than passing attention.

Yet the only reason offered by CUG for recommending equal numbers of student, faculty, and lay members is that numbers have "a psychological value in group interaction through discussion": if any one of these three "estates" had "merely nominal" representation its representatives would feel inferior and would contribute less than they should

(See page 3, col. 1)

staff and student numbers, it will be found that the non-laboratory university departments, chiefly those in the social sciences, are carrying by far the heaviest teaching duties in relation to their staff resources. That these departments are in many cases managing to serve with distinction under such conditions is surely impressive evidence of the quantitative and qualitative academic merits of the unitary system of university department organization.

This evidence is in no sense a denial of the social and cultural values of the colleges, for it is only a consequence of the combinatorial algebra of specialization as it applies to all aspects of a department's activities.

The large classes so frequently bemoaned by self-proclaimed advocates of liberal education are not evidence of cultural lack among these departments, but are a direct result of the fact that the staff resources necessary to equalize classes have been allocated elsewhere on the campus. That such imbalances have long been shielded by our internal structural complexities only adds to the urgency of real reform. Small classes indeed justify an apology to those students not fortunate enough, because of their choice of academic discipline, to enjoy them.

At the central level, the Commission has argued that the "double innocence" of the separation of financial and academic powers to Board and Senate is no longer workable and have called for a unitary governing body for the University. They have also called for the devolution of fiscal and academic authority to the faculty and departmental level. Many recommendations concerning the Colleges, however, are directly contrary to the inferences that the first of these conclusions implies for the second. Fragmentation of departments into many college components will only bring about a system of multiple innocence, even less workable than the double innocence we are now attempting to banish from the centre.

FORUM ON CUG

(Continued from page 2)

to the discussion: hence parity of the three estates is to be preferred.

There are three things wrong with this reasoning.

One is that it considers nothing between "merely nominal" numbers and equal numbers. But suppose a case were made on other grounds for a proportion of, say, 10-10-20: would either of the 10s be considered "merely nominal"? If not, the harmful effect attributed to nominal representation does not apply to everything less than equal representation, and the argument for equal numbers does not follow.

But if "nominal" is intended to include anything less than equal representation, then the proposition on which the argument relies is that any substantial inferiority of numbers leads to inferiority of performance. That proposition is false (which is the second thing wrong with the argument). It is at least contradicted by one very relevant piece of evidence, namely, the behaviour, over the last several years, of the elected faculty members of the President's Council. They have always been substantially fewer than the administration members —5, later 7, elected faculty out of well over 20—but that has never led them to take an inferior part in the deliberations of the whole body.

The third and most important thing wrong about the reasoning is that it treats students, faculty, and laymen as three "estates" within the university and leaves it to be assumed that the three groups have *equal* contributions to make to the determination of university policy. The absurdity of treating the lay representatives, who are by definition from outside the university, as an "estate" within the university, is less objectionable than the assumption that the three groups have *equal* contributions to make. No grounds are offered for this assumption. And the Commission itself in effect rejects it, at least in respect of the lay component.

The Commission argues the case for any lay component at all on quite other grounds, namely, on grounds of the watchdog function the laymen are expected to perform on behalf of the outside community. The argument is that the public, which pays, is entitled to have some direct representation on the top university body to ensure that what has become a very big business should be soundly managed. Whether lay representation, partly or wholly appointed by the government, is an effective or the most effective way of ensuring sound management might be disputed. But at least the Commission is right in basing the argument for lay members on the ground that they are outsiders. In any case, if we accept the need for the council to contain a watchdog, all that follows is that there should be enough of a lay element to be a watchdog: no pretence is needed that they would be expected to contribute equally with the students or faculty to the determination of policy. So why 20? Why not 9, which would be enough to give lay representation on each of the proposed 9 standing committees of the governing council?

The relative size of the student and faculty components should similarly be determined by their relative aptness to perform their part in the functions the governing council would have. Apart from the watchdog function, what functions would the council have? Bearing in mind the very substantial areas of decision-making which the Commission urges should be devolved on Department and Faculty councils, the main function of the University Council would be to set policy about academic and financial priorities so as best to promote the university as a centre for the advancement of learning in the broadest sense. I take that to include (1) the creation of new knowledge, new critical understanding, about man, society, and the universe; (2) the continuous development of new generations of people—students—who

(See page 4, col. 1)



President Bissell is host for CHEAR's first meeting in Canada

Presidents and a dean from seven Canadian and American universities attended the first conference held in Canada of the Council on Higher Education in the American Republics. President Claude Bissell, the host, is the only Canadian member of CHEAR, which is an agency of the Institute of International Education. Since 1919 IIE, a non-profit organization, has directed educational and cultural exchange programs in 26 countries on four continents. The CHEAR Toronto Conference discussed such subjects as graduate education in Canada, student unrest, and university government. Seen here at one of the sessions, around the table, left to right, are: Fred Armstrong, Director, Research and Projects, U.S. Steel Foundation; James

F. Tierney, Executive Director, CHEAR; Dr. Kenneth Holland, President, IIE and CHEAR; Dr. Hugh H. Saunderson, President, University of Manitoba; Dr. W. Allen Wallis, President, University of Rochester; Dr. Willard W. Cochrane, Dean, International Program, University of Minnesota; Miss Sheila Lyne, in charge of IIE secretariat; Forrest E. Allen, Administrator of Educational Programs, International Nickel Company; The Rev. Roger Guindon, Rector, University of Ottawa; Dr. Howard W. Johnson, President, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Dr. Bissell, conference chairman, and Mrs. Pearl G. Purcell, Vice-President, IIE and conference director. Dr. Henry Hicks, President, Dalhousie, was absent when the picture was taken.

Urge formation of University Support Staff Association

(Continued from page 1)

day before, to form an association of Support Staff.

Reading from a prepared statement, Mrs. Russell said: "The CUG Report suggests that the Support Staff form an association or organization that can act as spokesman for the purposes of bargaining and of representation on decision-making bodies. We would like to make it known that we are, in fact, actively in the process of forming an association of Support Staff. A Steering Committee has been established to formulate the constitution and by-laws to determine structure, powers, duties and objectives of the proposed association."

Mrs. Russell went on to announce that a general meeting of the entire Support Staff would be called in January.

Taking issue with certain sections of the CUG report, the statement read by Mrs. Russell went on:

"We would respectfully suggest that other than suggesting the formation of a unified body, the section of the CUG report dealing with the Support Staff shows insufficient consideration and little understanding of the complex problems of this essential group."

Mrs. Russell continued: "I find many of the statements made in the report to be rather ambiguous in their context. You suggest that as citizens of the University community we must have the right to participate in shaping those decisions that directly influence our well-being and indicate that at all levels of administration the interests of the Support Staff are affected. You then immediately deny us the right to active participation and representation on the top body—the Governing Council other than as Assessor Members, because we should not be considered to have a stake in the University as an academic institution."

Of all the proposed sub-committees of the Governing Council, Mrs. Russell went on, there was only one, the Academic Committee, in which Support Staff did not have a direct interest. All others are within the interests of the entire University community.

"I would, therefore, suggest," she said, "that the Support Staff have voting rep-

resentation, not Assessor membership, on the Governing Council. The extent of this voting representation is a matter that cannot, I think, be reasonably resolved at this juncture. Many suggest equal representation; others ask for fair representation; but we cannot dismiss the problem as you have done in the report by saying simply that this is a matter to be resolved by the Governing Council and the Support Staff, when it is apparently the desire of a very large number of the Support Staff to be represented on the Governing Council."

Miss Kathie Beeman (Banting and Best Institute) proposed to the meeting that CUPE (the Canadian Union of Public Employees) was the proper organization to represent Support Staff. She said it had 125,000 members, including members of the Support Staff of ten Canadian universities. M. L. Barnett (Physics Department) said that there were legal differences in the status of unions, as opposed to associations. Confirming this, Mrs. Russell said that a person could not be a member of both an association and a union; the one precluded the other.

The relative merits and differing powers of associations and unions was the subject of a good deal of discussion, the point being made that an organization that possessed legal bargaining powers on behalf of a group could not participate in the councils of the governing body with which it would want to negotiate. Someone asked the question (never answered) as to how teaching staff, who hoped to have membership on the proposed Governing Council could do so when the Association of Teaching Staff would presumably attempt to bargain with the same body.

R. A. K. Richards, architect in the Planning Division, said he saw the University as a symbiotic partnership, in which there should be neither senior nor junior status and wherein no one estate could exist without the others. He expressed the hope that any association that was formed to represent the Support Staff would be of a sort that would promote the development of a community that would best meet the needs of all concerned.

Appointed & Promoted

John Beckwith, composer, writer, teacher and pianist, has been appointed Dean of the Royal Conservatory of Music and the Faculty of Music. The appointment will be effective on July 1, 1970, upon the retirement of Dr. Boyd Neel, who while relinquishing his administrative responsibilities, will remain as a member of the music teaching staff.

Prof. Beckwith, born in Victoria, B.C. earned the degrees of Bachelor and Master of Music at U of T. He studied piano under Alberto Guerrero, composition in Paris with Nadia Boulanger. In 1965 Professor Beckwith was awarded a Canada Council senior arts fellowship to study electronic music and write an opera, *The Shiva*, with libretto by the poet James Reaney, which has not yet been finished.

Prof. Beckwith joined the Faculty of Music as a lecturer in 1952, became assistant professor in 1961, and five years later associate professor in the history and literature of music.

As a pianist, Professor Beckwith gave many vital and broadcast performances between 1947 and 1953, but now confines his performing activities to occasional playing and directing of his own works. These include a chamber opera, *Night Blooming Cereus* (1958); orchestral works, songs, chamber music, choral compositions, music for children, and a series of radio "Collages" in collaboration with Mr. Reaney. His music has been performed by orchestras, choirs, chamber groups and soloists both in Canada and abroad. He has filled commissions from the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, the National Film Board, Vancouver Festival, Vancouver Junior Symphony, Victoria Symphony, Toronto Mendelssohn Choir, Festival Singers of Toronto, Waterloo Lutheran University, and others. Many of his works have been recorded and published.

For several years Prof. Beckwith wrote reviews and a weekly music column for a Toronto daily newspaper (Star). He was an associate editor of the now defunct *Canadian Music Journal*. He has been a frequent contributor to music and literary journals and to several books and reference works. With Udo Kasemets he was co-editor of *The Modern Composer and His World*. Professor Beckwith for several years has been a script writer and arranger of recorded music radio programs and has broadcast reviews and commentaries on the CBC. Since 1966 he has been program annotator for the Toronto Symphony Orchestra.

FORUM ON CUG

(Continued from page 3)

will, later, create more new knowledge and critical understanding; and (3) the spreading of knowledge and critical understanding to as many as possible who desire it.

I do not think that the advancement of learning, so understood, can be best promoted by the faculty alone. The second and third functions clearly cannot be performed unless there is active co-operation of students and faculty in the teaching and learning process, and this is not likely to be forthcoming now unless students know that they have significant representation on the top body as well as at the other levels. But it does not follow that they need equal representation with the faculty on the top body.

I do not see how it can be taken for granted that students are equally competent with faculty to decide on over-all university policy. The faculty have, on the average, been at the job of creating knowledge, and of increasing understanding, longer than have the students: the faculty are the most advanced students: they have credentials which those less far along need not and, in the nature of the case, do not (yet) have: the faculty do know more about knowledge.

I know it is the view of some students that the very fact that the faculty have been at it longer is a disqualification, in that the combined effect of rapid social change and professorial specialization makes the professors insensitive or resistant to changes in the kind of knowledge and understanding the world now needs. That North American universities on the whole have exhibited massive insensitivity is not to be denied, though I would assert that this university is less culpable than the typical United States multiversity. But it has to be noticed that it is in each case not the faculty but the university as presently governed (never by the faculty) that has shown this insensitivity.

I would not for a moment suggest that giving all power to the faculty would correct this disastrous failing. I do not propose that all power should be given to the faculty. I think it is sufficiently evident that any rectification of the present situation requires a combination of faculty and student power.

But in what proportions? Here surely we have to weigh the faculty claim of superior acquaintance with the discipline of knowledge against the student claim of continually self-renewing freshness of insight into the problems that beset humanity. If we could assume that the students as a whole, and only the students, had that insight, we might conclude that the balance was equal. But we cannot make that assumption. No doubt the most socially-conscious students have more of this insight than the least socially-conscious faculty. And in the last two or three years it has been on the whole the students with the most advanced social consciousness who have been elected to the most important positions (as, for instance, in CUG itself).

But it would be foolish to erect a permanent system of university government on the assumption that that pattern of election is permanent. And even on that assumption, it is by no means clear that student representatives should, in the interest of the university as a continuing body devoted to the enhancement of knowledge and of critical understanding, govern equally with faculty representatives. On the contrary, if the function of the university is the advancement of learning, the presumption must be that those who are farther advanced in learning should have more say in university policy.

Given this, and given that neither the case made for administration members nor the case made for lay members on the governing council requires a substantial number of administrators or of laymen, it does not seem unreasonable to suggest that the faculty should have parity with all the others together.

C. B. MACPHERSON
Professor of Political Science

Stewart McLean

I submit that discussion of the Report of the Commission on the Government of the University of Toronto entitled "Toward Community in University Government" must begin with the consideration by everyone concerned of the most fundamental question it raises: "What is a University?" If there is no agreement about what it is, it is futile to attempt to find agreement about how it should be governed.

The Report stresses in its title that the University should be a "community" but can there be a community or at least a community of interest in an institution of the size and diversity of this University with Faculties, Institutes, Colleges, Departments and so on concerned with the whole range of academic and professional endeavour and with individuals in each of the divisions engaged in studies at every level? My contention is that their concern for scholarship is their only real common bond and that scholarship is the central concern of a university.

Scholarship is not synonymous with research and the preserve of the initiated few, it is an activity open to all who are prepared to devote themselves to it. Universities have traditionally served society by providing an environment which has encouraged all aspects of scholarly activity; they have recognized the value of original thinking even when the value of the discipline concerned was appreciated at the time by very few others, and men capable of contributions of this calibre have catalyzed scholarship throughout the university and have often affected the rest of society as well. A fundamental aim of scholarship is to communicate ideas and it is because of this that society has recognized the universities as institutions where members of society may be educated.

Universities have also served society by providing a readily available fund of technical and intellectual expertise and, although this service has often been less readily recognized by society, they have provided informed criticism of the social, political and cultural health of the larger community. It appears obvious to me that the value of a university's contributions in these and related areas results because of, rather than in spite of, the university's primary concern with scholarship; it is this that allows an individual to consider problems in a more rational manner, comment usefully and forcefully, if necessary, and have his views carry the authority of a scholar and an expert in a particular area.

Unfortunately, society has all too often had the picture of a university as a place where a prescribed ration of information is purveyed to the customers, who are eventually returned to society with the guarantee that they contain a certain minimum quantity of information and the expertise to keep the wheels of industry and commerce turning. It is even more unfortunate that this view, which is not unknown even in the universities themselves, appears to be coming even more widely accepted as society endeavors to have a greater number of its members attend a university. It may be that the present universities will, in fact, become knowledge factories and scholarship will find refuge in other institutions. I hope not, but this is what we must think about when we consider the reform of this university. It is possible to consider improving the university within the present framework or it may be that the structure must be reformed before the university can efficiently carry out its prime function, but it is not possible to change the structure of the institution to the point where scholarship is no longer its central concern without having it cease to be a university in the sense that I understand.

The view I have of a university is not a factional one and can be held by professors, students, or anyone else who is concerned for the university, scholarship, and the society in which we live; this represents a common interest and I deplore the current trend to consider professors and students as separate species with antagonistic interests. I do, however, recognize a difference in function

between students and professors. A professor is, or should be, a person who has shown more than the average competence in the field of his profession and the desire and ability to continue in a deeper and more thorough study of that field (in this sense he never ceases to be a "student"). An undergraduate or graduate student is, or should be, a person who has voluntarily and deliberately undertaken to study a field at a level determined by his background and the goal he has set himself. Learning is accomplished by those who wish to learn and are prepared to subject themselves to the discipline required; it should not be a process of indoctrination from above. The professor's responsibility is to provide leadership and guidance that will stimulate the student to think intelligently and productively about the current state of the field under study. Although a professor will have formed his own conclusions about the live issues in his field, he should still be able to stimulate the student to think for himself about the issues and reach his own conclusions based on the command of the field that he has acquired.

I have been reluctant to take the time and space to describe this model of a university since, until recently, I had assumed that it was the one accepted by essentially everyone in the University, even though I would expect some differences of opinion in detail. I still believe that it is the model that is in the mind of the great majority of university people, but the time has come when this view must be stated clearly and supported by all those who believe in it because it is clear that the Commissioners who wrote the Report have quite a different model in mind.

Although many of its recommendations will meet little opposition, the Report as a whole is a design for an institution where scholarship is no longer the central concern. The "community" it advocates is, in fact, a power structure in which division and factionalism are emphasized and perpetuated. The ideal form of government for a state may well arise from a situation where various political philosophies are in continuous tension, but this is not a suitable form of government in a university where the day-to-day questions are quite different from those in a state. It is not possible for anyone to devote himself to scholarship and still find time to be continuously concerned with problems of government. The University must receive its direction at the policy level from those most concerned and capable of providing it; in matters related to scholarship this ought to be the academic staff, not because they need their authority bolstered, but because it is their responsibility to give leadership in those areas in which they are considered authorities. The administration of the affairs of the University should continue to be in the hands of those who have shown a desire and an ability for this task; they should receive their authority as "civil servants" from the members of the University and carry out their duties by consent, but it is obvious that no one would accept one of these duties, onerous enough already, if he were not allowed a considerable amount of discretion after policy had been defined.

However, it is not my intention to try to give an outline of an ideal system of university government, but to make a plea for a more careful consideration of the issues raised by the Report. There are obviously members of the University who understand it and agree with it in principle; there are, I believe, many more who would reject it as far as its main theme is concerned but feel that it will be possible to implement only certain recommendations or modifications of them and so placate everyone without really changing anything. I believe that the questions it raises are much too important for this approach. Now is the time that the issues raised must be recognized, considered and, if possible, resolved; certainly there are key recommendations to be considered, particularly those which require amendment of the University of Toronto Act, but if discussion of these becomes simply an exercise in compromise and numerology, it may then be too late to have the real issues brought forward. I believe that the Commissioners have made a Report

the central theme of which is not supported by most of the members of the University, the senior Administration appears to have received it with alarming equanimity and the President's signature is at the head of it. Perhaps the Commissioners will argue that they did not receive briefs that were sufficient in weight or number (although it is clear that they did not attach much weight to briefs that expressed the views of a considerable proportion of the academic staff) and the Administration may have a similar argument. Perhaps the ordinary members of the University had no suspicion that such a radical restructuring of the University would be proposed; if so, it is time their opinions were expressed and directed to those responsible now for the government of the University. I repeat my point: any reform of the University must keep scholarship as the University's central concern. Without scholarship the institution will cease to be a university; its value as a centre of learning will disappear, its value to society in other roles will at least be diminished, and everyone inside and outside of the University will be a loser.

STEWART MCLEAN
Associate Professor
Department of Chemistry

* * *

W. W. Sawyer

Any organization is likely to drift into trouble if it has no clear concept of its aims. The word "university" has meant different things at different times, and there are various logical policies. What is important is that we should consciously choose one of these and stick to it.

One consistent policy is to try to attract to ourselves the leaders of research in all subjects. Since the teaching ability of these men and women will show wide variations, we should accept only students who are not dependent upon good teaching. Such students will benefit from contact with outstanding intellects and will be able to penetrate any obscurity of exposition.

Some European universities approximate to this model, but it clearly has no resemblance to the present situation in Canada. Our intake of students is vastly greater than could be envisaged with such a plan. Also European universities rest upon a much firmer foundation in the elementary and secondary schools. The European tendency is to stress the education of academically gifted students, to introduce them very early to serious studies, to let them advance at a rapid pace, and to encourage independent study already in the secondary schools.

The flexibility envisaged by Hall-Dennis creates the possibility that Canadian schools might provide both imaginative programs for the less academic student and also strenuous work, on the European model, for the ablest students. This latter development would enormously ease the work of the universities.

The reason why it cannot happen at present is that the supply of teachers with a strong academic background is entirely inadequate. This inadequacy can only be overcome if Canada develops some strong teaching institution. It is unrealistic to suppose that we can fill the schools with individuals having the intellectual force to break through the barrier of bad teaching and arrive at a sound understanding by their own powers. History shows that such individuals are few; they are the geniuses, the originators, the inventors. But the progress of civilization shows that there are very many people who can absorb a new idea when it is well and clearly explained.

The universities are not at present providing such a centre for the raising of academic standards. My own experience, and that of people in other subjects and in other institutions, is that universities somehow make it possible for students to get good grades in courses without understanding the central ideas and principles of these courses. These students obtain degrees; they do not get anything remotely resembling a university education. In fact they are probably worse off at the end than at the beginning of their university life.

Two courses are open to us. One is to declare that we are unable to meet the

(See page 5, col. 1)

FORUM ON CUG

(Continued from page 4)

needs of a large part of our students, and that some separate teaching institution should be created to relieve us of this responsibility. I would not object to this, but I shall be very surprised if we decide to do it. The alternative is to make adequate arrangements for teaching our enormous intake of students.

It will not be easy to do this. The "publish or perish" tradition is very strong. A good teacher has to be a scholar. He must spend a lot of his time in library or laboratory in order to be quite sure that he is giving the best possible leadership to his students. But it is by no means certain that his labours will be regarded as academically impressive. It is not certain that he will survive as a university professor. There is in fact no institution that caters for the kind of life he wants to lead.

I do not wish in any way to scoff at research. It is only by consulting the findings of research workers that a teacher can check the accuracy of his own ideas. But there should be some kind of balance between the acquisition of new knowledge and its diffusion. A new discovery is sterile so long as nobody knows about it. And personally I would value a professor of English, who communicated a delight in literature to his students, more than one who had done original work on some obscure author.

There seems to be no logical reason why students should influence the choice of a professor concerned with advanced research in his subject. On the other hand, students have a very real interest in being well taught. Giving them some political power in appointments where teaching ability was a major factor would create a force to balance the very strong pressures in the opposite direction.

It is objected that students would vote for a professor who gave them all A grades. Such difficulties are not insuperable; it would, for example, be possible for professors in a department to compare their examination papers and methods of marking, in order to ensure some uniformity of standards.

W. W. SAWYER
Department of Mathematics
and College of Education

★ ★ ★

John S. Wood

In relation to the CUG Report, I want to discuss here not the issues themselves but the way in which those issues are raised, the slant given to the arguments, and the underlying assumption that the recommendations arrived at are the only viable ones. I shall be brief, partly because we are asked to be, partly because brevity is not incompatible with relevance.

The Report is in my opinion biased; its whole tone appears anti-faculty, and charged with a heavy-handed irony of which the faculty is the butt. It assumes a façade of impartiality; in fact it is partial, often in an insidious way. A few examples will have to suffice.

The "Traditional View" occupies half a page; throughout it runs a slightly sarcastic and superior tone which depreciates the so-called "View". The "Radical View", on the other hand, is a

First stage of Scarborough College expansion is scheduled to begin this spring

Preliminary plans for the expansion of Scarborough College in six stages until it attains an enrolment of 5,000 students have been announced by Principal A. F. Wynne Plumptre. The Board of Governors and the Ontario Government have approved a start on the first stage, which upon completion in 1971, will enable the College to accept an additional 500 students. The anticipated cost will be \$7,000,000.

Each of the next five stages will be designed to take care of an increase of 500 students until the eventual enrolment of 5,000 has been reached in 1976, if the expansion plans proceed as it is hoped they will.

Work will begin next March or April

on Phase 2A, the first expansion stage, Principal Plumptre said. This will provide 19 seminar rooms, 20 faculty offices, with research laboratories for science professors; student common rooms, quiet study areas, recreation areas, an additional cafeteria, a snack room, and a gymnasium which will be adequate for the College when it has its maximum number of students. The nine lecture theatres and 30 teaching laboratories in the present complex are considered adequate for the time being. The additional study areas in Phase 2A will relieve the pressure on the library and a separate library building will not be erected until Phase 2B.

whole page in length, weighted with terms of contempt and fiercely condemnatory of the first "View". These are not two unbiased presentations of a case, despite the disarming footnote (col. 1, p. 7); they are already destructive of one point of view, unless I am oversensitive to linguistic usage and shades of meaning.

Let us go on. One sentence is enough to acknowledge the existence of a brief submitted by the Association of the Teaching Staff (and backed by several hundred faculty members); the brief from the S.A.C. is not only mentioned, but the most sweeping statements in it are quoted in full, with apparent approval. The rare remark which is not implicitly critical of faculty is immediately qualified, lest too much commendation may have been given; for example, on page 19: "Most faculty do not, in fact, need any regulations to prevent improper allocation of their time and energy. Nevertheless there are abuses." The alumni, who might legitimately be thought to have some right to express their opinions, receive extremely short shrift; the preamble to Recommendation 4 mentions "recent alumni", the recommendation that immediately follows omits all reference to them. To whom is this omission a concession?

The kind of reasoning that the Report employs may satisfy a logician; in me it merely arouses suspicions. For example, the composition of department councils. Far from us, asserts the Report on p. 25, to impose any arrangements, but the reader is hastily informed that on the Commission itself "staff-student parity worked well." Could this be a warning to the wise? If one accepts Recommendation 57 that immediately follows, one virtually accepts staff-student parity, since the negotiating committees are to be constructed on that basis; and if all else fails an ad hoc committee (Recommendation 61) will be formed and will impose a solution. On this committee there will be parity. The case seems to me to be judged in advance.

This in fact illustrates what I consider is the worst thing about the Report, namely that not only does it not seriously entertain any other solutions than its own, it renders any other points of view irrelevant. Recommendation 1 affirms "openness" as a "basic operating principle for all university councils and committees." Recommendation 107 proposes a Governing Council "with final control over all financial and academic matters"; on this council there is to be staff-student parity. Between these two recommendations, which taken together would determine the complete restructuring of the university on pre-established lines, the faculty is caught. Effective discussion is precluded. The door is simply opened wider for the anti-faculty elements to cry "paranoia" and utter threats of coercion.

Is then the CUG Report a travesty of democracy, and a subtle example of modern advertising technique, which seeks to convince by repetition? I find it difficult to conclude otherwise.

JOHN S. WOOD
Professor of French
Victoria College



John H. Lee is appointed Comptroller

The appointment of John Harrison Lee, C.A., left, as Comptroller of the University has been announced with effect from January 1, 1970. Mr. Lee held the post of Chief Accountant previously, and his new title reflects more accurately the broad area of his responsibilities in the financial operations of the University. At the same time, the appointment of Robert George White, R.I.A., as Assistant Comptroller is also announced. Mr. White, formerly executive assistant to Mr. Lee, brings to this position several years of experience in senior financial management. The title of Chief Accountant will be discontinued.

SGS Council reaffirms belief in retaining unitary organization

A Special Meeting of the Council of the School of Graduate Studies was held on December 9, 1969, to discuss the Report of the Commission on University Government. Dr. James S. Thompson attended on behalf of the Commission. Discussion at this meeting was devoted primarily to the Report's chapter on the School of Graduate Studies and its recommendations concerning the School.

It was pointed out that the CUG Report presented two opposing and unreconciled views of the School of Graduate Studies, and that, in support of the concept of a unitary graduate school, one view accepts and summarizes the brief submitted to CUG by Council. The opposite view contains many factual inaccuracies and erroneous assertions, and, in the opinion of Council, fails in any way to rebut the arguments presented by Council. The following resolution was unanimously approved:

This Council reaffirms the conviction expressed in its Brief to the Commission on University Government that the present mode of organizing graduate work in the University under a unitary School of Graduate Studies supervising and administering all graduate degree programs should be retained and continued; nevertheless, if a new Governing Council is established, this Council has no objection to the recommendation of the CUG Report (No. 88) that the Governing Council establish a committee to review the government of the School.

Council had no objection to the recommended change in name from "School" to "Faculty" (recommendation 85), though there was considerable doubt about the recommendation that such a Faculty "have the same status and responsibilities as other faculties in the university." Dr. Thompson explained that the recommended change in name was an attempt to achieve consistency of nomenclature throughout the University. The Commission fully appreciated that there were bound to be differences between a horizontally organized unitary faculty and the vertically organized faculties, and intended no change in the School's function and responsibilities; the change in name would, however, clarify its status as a senior academic unit. Earlier discussion had already

clarified the unique aspects of the School's operations, emphasizing its limited budgetary role and confirming that it had no intention of encroaching on the responsibilities of the faculty deans. With Dr. Thompson's assurance that the clause meant only that the School (or Faculty) would report directly to the Governing Council and that it would be responsible for the degrees entrusted to it, Council supported the intent of CUG recommendation 85.

Confirmation of this recommendation strengthened a concern about the effect of recommendations 79 and 82(d) which, taken together, implied that graduate students would be denied a major influence in budgetary matters just as such influence was being given to undergraduates, since these recommendations gave undergraduates membership on faculty councils and gave such councils a major role in budgetary allocations, but graduate students would be members only of this Council, and the budgetary role of the SGS is very limited. CUG recommendations 56, 58, 59 and 66 further reduce the graduate students' ability to compete for a fair share of the University's resources even at the departmental level. One solution, it was suggested, might be the inclusion of graduate student representatives on undergraduate faculty councils, but this would have serious implications for a unitary graduate school. Another suggestion was that the SGS should have a greater formal role in resource allocation in the University; it was recognized that the Dean is now involved in this function, but involving the Council too would give graduate students a fair share of influence. A third suggestion was that budgetary matters should continue to be part of the executive function, rather than becoming a function of councils. It was clear that the relevant CUG recommendations, when taken together as they stood, created serious problems with respect to faculty budgets and resource allocation, and might lead to the diminution of attention to the needs of graduate work.

Discussion of the Report is to be continued at a second Special Meeting of the CGC Council, to be held on Tuesday, January 13, 1970, at 3 p.m., in the Council Chamber of the Galbraith Building.

COMING EVENTS

JANUARY

8 THURSDAY

Lectures

"U.S. National Nutrition Survey". Dr. A. E. Schaefer, Chief of Nutrition Program, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Room 103, Hygiene Building. 4 p.m. (School of Graduate Studies and School of Hygiene)

"Joseph Brodsky as Metaphysical Poet". Prof. George Kline, Bryn Mawr College. Room 2118, Sidney Smith Hall. 4.10 p.m. (School of Graduate Studies and Slavic Languages and Literatures)

"The Case for Final Causality". First in a series of lectures "Finalism Revisited". Prof. Etienne Gilson. Carr Hall, St. Michael's College. 4.10 p.m. (Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies)

"The History of Tuning". Prof. Peter B. Yates. Concert Hall, Edward Johnson Building. 2 p.m. Free. (Faculty of Music)

Alfons and Aloys Kontarsky, duo pianists. Concert Hall, Edward Johnson Building. 8.30 p.m. Single ticket \$3, student \$2. (Faculty of Music)

Music

9 FRIDAY

Lecture

"A Contribution to the New Theory of Demand". Prof. R. G. Lipsey, Visiting Professor, University of British Columbia. Room 3050, Sidney Smith Hall. 2 p.m. (School of Graduate Studies and Department of Political Economy)

"The Certainty of Mathematics from Cusanus to Galileo". Paul Lawrence Rose. Rhodes Room, Trinity College. 2.10 p.m. (Institute for the History and Philosophy of Science and Technology)

11 SUNDAY

Films

"Challenge of the Oceans" and "The Eagle has Landed: The Flight of Apollo 11". Museum Theatre, ROM. 2 p.m.

Canadian Children's Opera Chorus. Director, Lloyd Bradshaw. Scarborough College. 3.45 p.m. Admission free.

Music

12 MONDAY

Music

Thomas Monahan, double bass. Concert Hall, Edward Johnson Building. 1 p.m. Free. (Faculty of Music)

13 TUESDAY

Lectures

"Lazzi and Laugh-In: The Theatre-Italien in Paris, 1660-1762". Prof. E. A. Walker. Lecture Hall, Academic Building, Victoria University. 4.30 p.m. (Victoria College Public Lectures 1970)

"The Reactive Cerebral Vessels". Dr. Bennett Stein, Department of Neurosurgery, College of Physicians and Surgeons, Columbia University. Osler Hall, Academy of Medicine. 5 p.m. (Toronto Neurological Society)

14 WEDNESDAY

Lectures

"The Scientific Papers and Optics Research of Lord Rayleigh". Dr. John Howard, editor, American Journal of Applied Optics. Room 202, McLennan Physical Laboratories. 1.10 p.m. Sponsored by the Varsity Fund. (Institute for the History and Philosophy of Science and Technology)

"Problems in the Dislocation Dynamics of b.c.c. Metals". Dr. W. J. Bratina, Ontario Research Foundation. Room 116, Wallberg Building. 3.30 p.m. (School of Graduate Studies and Department of Metallurgy and Materials Science)

"Golding, Ovid and Shakespearean Heroic Tragedy". Prof. Reuben Brower, Harvard University. Room 122, University College. 4.30 p.m. (School of Graduate Studies, Graduate Department of Classical Studies and Graduate Program in Comparative Literature)

"What is Crime and Why Do We Fight It?" P. Macnaughton-Smith. Room 3153, Medical Sciences Building. 7.30 p.m. (Centre of Criminology)

Seminar

"The Intimate Relationship Between Plasma Antithrombin and Heparin-Cofactor". Dr. F. C. Monkhouse. Room 3227, Medical Sciences Building. 4 p.m. (Department of Physiology)

Tours

"Egypt"—noon. "West Asia"—1 p.m. "Japan"—2 p.m. Meet in Armour Court, main floor, ROM.

15 THURSDAY

Lectures

"Animal Imagery in Romanesque Sculpture: the Trumeau of Souillac". Prof. Harry Bober, Institute of Fine Arts, New York University. Room 2118, Sidney Smith Hall, 4 p.m. (Centre for Medieval Studies and School of Graduate Studies)

"Wind and Wave Measurement in the High Atmosphere from Meteor Trail Radar Detection". Dr. A. Spizzichino, Centre National d'Etude des Telecommunications, Paris. Room 102, Burton Tower, 4 p.m. (School of Graduate Studies and Department of Physics)

"Finalism Revisited" series. "The Case for the Mechanical Cause". Prof. Etienne Gilson. Carr Hall, St. Michael's College. 4.10 p.m. (Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies)

"Elizabethan Translations of Heroic Poetry". Prof. Reuben Brower. Room 341, Larkin Building, Trinity College. 11 a.m. (School of Graduate Studies, Graduate Department of Classical Studies and Graduate Program in Comparative Literature)

Seminar

Paul Brodie, Saxophone. Concert Hall, Edward Johnson Building. 2 p.m. Free. (Faculty of Music)

Music

University of Toronto Symphony Orchestra. Conductor, Victor Feldbrill. MacMillan Theatre, Edward Johnson Building. 8.30 p.m. Free. (Faculty of Music)

16 FRIDAY

Lecture

"Problems of Objectivity in the Social Sciences". Prof. Richard Ruder, chairman of the Department of Philosophy, Washington University, St. Louis, and editor of the Journal *Philosophy of Science*. Room 202, McLennan Physical Laboratories. 1.10 p.m. Sponsored by the Varsity Fund. (Institute for the History and Philosophy of Science and Technology)

"Elemental Animal Imagery". Prof. Harry Bober. Room 1069, Sidney Smith Hall, 4 p.m. (Centre for Medieval Studies and School of Graduate Studies)

Hockey. Guelph at Varsity. Varsity Stadium. 8 p.m.

18 SUNDAY

Music

Canadian Concerts Orchestra. Conductor, Walter Babiak. Scarborough College. 3.45 p.m. Free.

19 MONDAY

Music

Faculty of Music Ensembles. Concert Hall, Edward Johnson Building. 1 p.m. Free. (Faculty of Music)

20 TUESDAY

Lectures

"Na-K Transport in Cell Membrane". Dr. A. Sen. Room 2172, Medical Sciences Building. 4 p.m. (Department of Physiology)

"The Yorkshire Cycles: Variations on a Theme". Prof. Alexandra Johnston. Lecture Hall, Academic Building, Victoria University. 4.30 p.m. (Victoria College Public Lectures 1970)

"Structural Evolution of the Southern Canadian Rockies". Dr. R. A. Price, Department of Geological Sciences, Queen's University. Room 128, Mining Building. 4 p.m. Coffee 3.30 p.m. (Department of Geology)

"Is There an Employment Barrier?" A panel talks to Ralph Gauvreau, Canada Manpower and Immigration. Scarborough College. 8 p.m.

21 WEDNESDAY

Tours

"English Furniture"—Noon. "Mineralogy"—1 p.m. "Musical Instruments"—2 p.m. Armour Court, main floor, ROM.

Hockey. Windsor at Varsity. Varsity Stadium. 8 p.m.

Basketball. Waterloo at Varsity. Hart House. 8.15 p.m.

22 THURSDAY

Lectures

"Finalism Revisited" series. "Finalism and Physical Probability". Prof. Etienne Gilson. Carr Hall, St. Michael's College. 4.10 p.m. (Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies)

"Pesticides—Harvest of Death". Dr. D. A. Chant. Room 4, ROM. 8.30 p.m. Admission \$1.50. ROM Members free.

"Theory of Supernovae". Dr. Philip Morrison, Department of Physics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Room 102, McLennan Physical Laboratories, 4.10 p.m. (School of Graduate Studies and Departments of Astronomy and Physics)

23 FRIDAY

Ball

Arts and Science Faculty Ball. Supper, dancing, cards. Tickets, \$9 per person, available from Mrs. D. A. Stager (924-4261). Great Hall, Hart House. 7 p.m. to 1 a.m. (University Arts Women's Club)

"Science in Science Fiction". Prof. Darko Suvin, McGill University. Rhodes Room, Trinity College. 2.10 p.m. (Institute for the History and Philosophy of Science and Technology)

Ph.D. Orals

Wednesday, January 28

John Whitelaw, Centre for Medieval Studies. "The Idea of Poverty as Virtue, and its Role in the Historical Development of the Church According to Some Writings of Petrus Ioniensis (1248-1298)". Thesis supervisor: Prof. L. E. Boyle. Room 207, 65 St. George Street. 2 p.m.

Tuesday, January 6

Klaus A. Quickert, Department of Chemistry. "Relative Rates of Isotopic Hydrogen Atom-Molecule Reactions". Thesis supervisor: Prof. D. J. Le Roy. Room 201, 65 St. George Street. 10 a.m.

E. P. Lozowski, Department of Physics. "Numerical Simulation of Flow Through and Around a Dilute Localized Assemblage of Particles". Thesis supervisor: Prof. R. List. Room 201, 65 St. George Street. 2 p.m.

Thursday, January 8

K. Waliuzzaman, Department of Electrical Engineering. "Multi-Valued Switching Systems". Thesis supervisor: Prof. K. C. Smith. Room 201, 65 St. George Street. 2 p.m.

Thursday, January 15

K. G. Ryan, Department of Bio-Medical Electronics. "Electrophoretic Studies of Subcellular Particles Involved in Synaptic Transmission". Thesis supervisor: Prof. E. L. Thomas. Room 201, 65 St. George Street. 2 p.m.

Tuesday, January 20

E. C. Looi, Department of Physics. "Frequency Perturbations and Line Broadening in the Vibrational Raman Spectra of Compressed Hydrogen and Deuterium". Thesis supervisor: Prof. J. C. Stryland. Room 201, 65 St. George Street. 2 p.m.

Monday, January 26

P. D. Shepherd, Department of Metallurgy and Materials Science. "The Solidification of Off-Eutectic Al-Cu Alloys and their Mechanical Properties". Thesis supervisor: Prof. G. B. Craig. Room 201, 65 St. George Street. 10 a.m.

Tuesday, January 27

John Chamberlin, Centre for Medieval Studies. "Medieval Arts of Discourse and the Development of Scriptural Figures in Donne's Sermons". Thesis supervisor: Prof. Millar MacLure. Room 207, 65 St. George Street. 4 p.m.

"Batiks". Louis Steyn, South Africa's foremost batik artist exhibits more than 50 of his wildlife hangings. Exhibition Hall, ROM. To Feb. 11.

"McLaughlin Planetarium". "The Star of Bethlehem" continues to Jan. 11. "The Story of Eclipses". Jan. 13 to Apr. 5. Tuesday to Friday, 3.30 and 8 p.m.; Saturday, 11 a.m., 2, 3.30, 5 and 8 p.m.; Sunday, 2, 3.30, 5 and 7.30 p.m. Adults \$1, students 50¢. Children under eight not admitted to the Star Theatre.

"Building with Wood". Technology and preservation of early Ontario Buildings shown through drawings, artifacts and several examples from the ROM's McRae models of pioneer life. Third floor rotunda, ROM. Jan. 13 to Feb. 15.

"Narrative of Discovery". Rare books, pictures, early maps and charts trace the exploration of Canada from the 15th to 19th centuries. Sigmund Samuel Canadiana Building. To March 29.

U of T research readers are now eligible for library cards with extended privileges

Post-doctoral fellows, research associates and research assistants attached to the University of Toronto are now eligible for Research Reader cards at the University Library, under a ruling made by the University's Library Council last spring. This ruling amounts to a clarification and extension of the privileges of these readers. The holder of a "research" card may borrow ten books for two weeks renewable for another two weeks, bound serials for two weeks non-renewable, current serials for one week, and the latest issue overnight.

To apply for such a card, a research assistant or associate should present his letter of appointment (giving his position

the name of the faculty member for whom he is working (if relevant) and personnel number) to the Library Office. A post-doctoral fellow (except in the Faculty of Medicine) when applying at the Library Office should present his purple post-doctoral fellow card, which is available from the Office of Research Administration in Simcoe Hall. Post-doctoral fellows in the Faculty of Medicine register first with the Division of Post Graduate Medical Education, before applying in the Library Office.

As before, a person who is enrolled in a student program while holding a part-time position on the University staff will use his student-card in the Library, and will not be eligible for a "research" card.

STAFF NOTES

Administration

PRESIDENT CLAUDE BISSELL is one of three university presidents recently named Companions of the Order of Canada. The others are DR. H. ROCKE ROBERTSON of McGill University, and MOST REV. LOUIS-ALBERT VACHON, of Université Laval.

Arts and Science

PROF. WILLIAM J. SAMARIN took part in a conference on "Approaches to Social Dialects" called by the U.S. Office of Education and organized by the Center for Applied Linguistics, in Washington, Oct. 31-Nov. 1.

DR. W. P. CARSTENS delivered a public lecture on "The Growth of Peasantry" in the series, Africa 1969-70, at Carleton University on Nov. 7.

PROF. R. M. SMITH attended the meeting of the Mid-West Branch of the American Oriental Society at Bloomington, Ind. Nov. 3 and 4, and delivered a paper "A Brahman Speaks". He was elected president of the Mid-West Branch for 1969-70.

PROF. ALAN JOFLING gave a (joint) paper entitled "Glacio-Fluvial Sedimentation of the Brampton Esker, Ontario" at the VIII International Congress of Quaternary Research, Paris, in September. He spent last summer as visiting professor, School of Earth Sciences, Macquarie University, Australia, and gave talks at various Australian institutions, including the Royal Society of New South Wales, Geological Society of Australia, Australian National University, Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization, and University of Tasmania.

University College

PROF. D. B. Redford delivered an illustrated lecture on "Ancient Egyptian Sculpture and Relief" to the Oxford County Art Association on Oct. 25 in Woodstock, Ont.

(See page 8, col. 1)

Discipline plans

(Continued from page 1)

The committee, he said, would draw up its own terms of reference.

In a preliminary discussion, the members agreed that their work should result in more than just another report to the President, and they hoped that some changes at least could be effected directly by the committee. Some members felt strongly that, unless they were to be involved with implementation rather than just discussion, the committee would be a waste of time.

Asked for an analysis of the present legal situation, Mr. Ross said that the University of Toronto Act empowered the Board of Governors to change the composition of any body except the Committee of Election (of the Chancellor) and the Senate. Changes on the faculty level were within the authority of the faculty or college concerned.

It was then proposed that the committee review the Campbell Report, recommend the bodies to be set up, and take these recommendations to the various constituencies for discussion in an attempt to arrive at a consensus. The resulting recommendations would then be taken to the President and, through him, to the Board.

It was generally agreed that there should be a regular dialogue in order to avoid a collapse of the principles established by the committee when they were referred to the constituencies represented by the committee members. It was recognized that the committee members were in a somewhat different position from that of the members of the original Campbell Committee, now that there was a committee working toward actual implementation. The members would be, to a somewhat greater extent, bound by their constituencies and there should be more consultation.

By a majority vote, the committee approved a motion by Mr. Hankey and Mr. Beyer that "meetings of the committee be open and that openness be defined as open to any auditor. Any auditor who wishes to speak may do so by being sponsored by one of the members of the committee. If there are any objections, it will be put to a vote. The committee may move into closed session by a simple majority vote of the members present".

"A scholar of weight and principle... has added to the stature and to the status of this, our University"

When the University's LL.D. degree was conferred on Prof. Bertie Wilkinson in December, Rev. L. K. Shook, left, was the chaplain and Prof. A. P. Thornton read the citation, which follows:

Mr. Chancellor, it is with a true and particular pleasure that I come forward tonight, as the present chairman of a Department which was graced by Professor Bertie Wilkinson for 31 years, to present him to you and to this Convocation as a fitting recipient of this University's degree of Doctor of Laws.

Bertie Wilkinson was born in Yorkshire in 1898, and took his degree of Master of Arts at the University of Manchester in 1921. He was accordingly a graduate of that very distinguished school of medieval studies which was founded at that University by James Tait and continued by T. F. Tout. Manchester University awarded him the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in 1926 while he was a lecturer in medieval history at the University College of the Southwest, now the University of Exeter. He returned to his *alma mater* at Manchester as a lecturer in constitutional history between 1930 and 1938. It was in 1938, 31 years ago, that he was appointed as full Professor of History in our Department here at Toronto, and he held that post from that time until his retirement in 1967.

It was therefore in our own company, within our own walls, that Professor Wilkinson built up his international reputation in his chosen field of medieval studies. A Fellow of the Mediaeval Academy of America, sometime Vice-President of the Mediaeval Society of America, and a Fellow of the Royal Society of Canada, he is known everywhere as an original and meticulous scholar who has thrown a great deal of light, and on occasion some heat, on the very intricate administrative and constitutional issues that condition and guide the path of English history in the Middle Ages. His *magnum opus* is *A Constitutional History of Medieval England*, in four volumes; and only two months ago he published a summation of his views on the field of his life's work entitled *The Later Middle Ages in England*. He has retired from active teaching service, but not from productive scholarship: he is even now squaring to that most tenacious of problems, *The Origins of Parliament*. In his case, when we look at what is called in the profession a "curriculum vitae" we become at once aware of a most formidable record of achievement. It attests both to his devotion and to his stamina—for since 1924 hardly a year has gone by that did not see the publication by Bertie Wilkinson of some review, review-article, chapter, or book. It is a record that sets up a model for us all, but to my knowledge not many in his own generation and even fewer among his successors can match it. Some do not even approach it.

All his writing expresses the strong personality and the determined zeal that he brings to all his actions. It illustrates a ranging mind, a love of learning, and an entire respect for the integrity of his subject. To him belongs in great measure what another splendid historian of his generation, his exact contemporary Sir Keith Hancock, has set out as the essential equipment for the true historian: the qualities of "attachment, justice, and span." The international fellowship of his colleagues recently compiled in his honour a *Festschrift* of original articles, which is itself an important contribution to medieval studies: and it was my pleasure earlier this evening to present him with a specially bound and inscribed copy of this work, as our History Department's own particular gift. I noted on studying Bertie Wilkinson's professional record that in 1933, when he was 35 years old, he himself had contributed to a similar *Festschrift* in honour of James Tait of Manchester. The editors of that particular work were Goronwy Edwards, Vivian Galbraith, and Ernest Jacob. All these three gentlemen have lived to contribute, in their turn, to Professor Wilkinson's own *Festschrift*. This makes, I think, a pleasing



comment on the longevity, the durability, and the inescapable distinction of medieval historians.

It is also worth emphasis that, in the world of academic affairs wherein professional standards have come under much fire, and when charges of irrelevance are so often levelled at the concept of scholarship, that Professor Wilkinson's work remains of a kind which both adorns that world and is relevant to the issues that confront and indeed hag-ride the modern university.

Bertie Wilkinson has always been a man of certain commitment. He has never detached himself from everyday affairs and from the care of and attention to a host of students. As a teacher several generations of Toronto students have known him and loved him as a man who was ready to take great pains, not only concerning their intellectual development, but also on any personal matters which they chose to lay before him. The range of his learning gave depth and force to his emotional understanding, and his experience of practical affairs has cast him as a man of genial commonsense—of a type which the North of England sometimes feels it has the monopoly. He served with the British Army between 1916 and 1919, and took duty with the Canadian Officers' Training Corps between 1939 and 1945. More recently, he was the moving force in the founding and early direction of the Medieval Centre at this University which, even in the short time that it has been in being, has won for itself a deserved reputation for high scholarship.

Two great themes inform his writing and bear witness to his philosophy of life. He delights to trace in the historical record both the wellsprings of liberty and the foundations of order: all his books make comment on these themes. And these are, surely, among the most significant that exist. In his work we find

a vivid presentation of the life and times of men who left a mark and stamp on their society which to this day have not been effaced. He is not the kind of historian who forgets that it is men who make movements, not movements that create men: and he knows, too, that ideas do not exist independent of men's minds. An individualist himself, he knows the power that individuals can command, and he brings sympathy to the story of their trials and errors. History is the only account-book men have for reference, for in it is listed what everything costs. Professor Wilkinson knows how to reckon up that tally. A bright strain of idealism and optimism runs through his writing, and no one can accuse him of belonging to what Thomas Carlyle called the tribe of Dry-as-Dust. At times, indeed, he has found himself beset with academic critics; but what Richard Cobden once said of his own political foe, Lord Palmerston, is surely true of Bertie Wilkinson—"He is of that happy nature that cannot create a personal enemy."

He himself, I know, would not wish me or anyone to conclude even an inadequate summary of his own life and times without a mention of his devoted companion of so many years, his wife Edith—who has always brought, will always bring, her especial gift of warmth to reinforce and encourage his own qualities of mind and heart.

There is no doubt at all, Sir, that the name of Bertie Wilkinson, a scholar of weight and principle, has brought lustre to the reputation of his profession and has added to the stature and to the status of this, our own University, during the long period that he has been among us. It is for these reasons, Mr. Chancellor, that I am most happy to have the honour of presenting him to you as the recipient of the Degree of Doctor of Laws, *honoris causa*.

Graduate Council discusses equivalence of overseas degrees

Summary of minutes of the Council, School of Graduate Studies, November 18, 1969:

Minutes

Council approved the minutes of the meeting of October 21, 1969.

Business Rising

The 2-year graduate program leading to the degree of Master of Library Science received Senate approval on November 18.

Dean's Report

i. Senate approval has been given to the program of inter-university cooperation in graduate instruction, and to the degree of Master of Museology. This degree program is now in effect.

ii. A report on enrolment at November 4, 1969, showed a total of 4204 full-time students enrolled (compared with 3711 at December 1, 1968) and 1792 part-time (compared with 1465), for an overall increase of 820 (15.8%). There will be some changes before the official reporting date, December 1, 1969.

A report on the citizenship of students enrolled at October 31, 1969, showed a Canadian component of 67.5%, landed immigrants 21.2%, persons on student visas from USA 3.6%, UK 1.3%, Europe 0.7%, Asia 3.2%, Africa 0.9%, and others 1.6%. The corresponding figures for May 31, 1969, were: 67.7%, 16.0%, 5.3%, 1.8%, 0.9%, 5.4%, 1.1%, and 1.9%. There was (See page 8, col. 3)

Senate to hold special sessions for discussion of CUG Report

The Senate at its December meeting accepted a recommendation that "a number of special Senate meetings" be held to discuss four major areas in the report of the Commission on University Government. The first meeting is to be held as early in January as possible.

The recommendation was made by a Senate steering committee, consisting of Prof. W. H. Dunphy, chairman; Prof. J. G. Slater, Prof. G. R. Slemmon, Prof. J. J. Carroll, G. M. Brodsky, Mrs. P. Fleury, and Robert L. Hicks, who was non-voting representative of graduates on CUG.

The committee's report follows:

"The committee is aware that a great many topics and questions are discussed in the CUG report and that they relate to all levels of government in the University. After careful consideration, the committee wishes to recommend that the Senate focus its attention in the discussions on the following four major areas:

"1. The nature and powers of the Governing Council.

"2. The composition of the Governing Council.

"3. The role of the constituent and federated colleges.

"4. The role of the President.

"The committee recommends that these topics be discussed in a number of special Senate meetings.

"In order to facilitate the discussions, the committee wishes to recommend the following rules of procedure for the special meetings to discuss the CUG report:

"1. The President would designate a chairman for the special meetings.

"2. The members of the Commission on University Government would be invited to be present at all special meetings of the Senate discussion of the CUG report.

"3. The members of the Commission on University Government would be invited to participate in these special meetings as resource persons. One or two resource persons would lead off the discussion with brief introductory remarks on the topic concerned.

"4. The special meetings discussing the CUG report would be open meetings, subject to the normal rules of the Senate concerning openness.

"5. The Senate would consider the appropriate time to invite separately, representatives of the Board of Governors and the students to one or more of the special meetings.

"It is further recommended that the President be empowered to call the first special meeting as early in January as possible.

The steering committee is confident that the members of the Senate have already read the CUG report very carefully. However, it was thought that it might be helpful if the committee listed minimum recommended readings concerning each one of the four major areas mentioned earlier."

The committee then listed for reading in the CUG report these sections: Chapter 12, the Governing Structure; Recommendation 107; the draft University of Toronto Act, Sections 2 to 7 inclusive; explanatory notes, Sections (a), (b), (c), (d) and (f), which accompany the draft statute, and Chapter 11, The Colleges (background information only).

Mr. Hicks said he presumed that discussion would not be restricted to the four subjects proposed. Prof. Slater said the Senate might wish to add other items, although the committee had not suggested others. Under the first topic, there could be a discussion of the relative merits of unicameral and bicameral governing structures.

Such questions as student participation in government and parity would probably come up in the discussion of the composition of the Governing Council, Prof. Dunphy said.

Prof. Bernard Etkin, voting member of CUG, thought it would be useful if the Senate would take some specific positions. He asked if the steering committee had considered having resolutions moved and voted upon.

It was hoped that there would be full debate, said Prof. Dunphy, and he thought resolutions might come forth as a result, rather than that there might be resolutions followed by debate, which might be restrictive to the discussion. The committee did not intend to exclude any topic having a bearing on the government of the University, although it had singled out four points for particular discussion. The committee would be delighted if the Senate decided to hold 20 meetings to discuss 20 topics.

Prof. D. A. MacRae inquired as to whether or not consideration had been given to inviting resource people other than CUG, people who might have another point of view. Prof. Dunphy replied that the committee's discussions were not exclusive, that they had been designed as guidance.

The Senate received a report from Principal Plumptre on the development of Scarborough College from early 1963 until the present time.

The Senate approved the Report of the School of Business concerning the appointment of part-time lecturers to be examiners in the Diploma Course in Business Administration.

man of the concurrent Commission on "Relations between Universities and Other Types of Institutions of Post-Secondary Education" and Prof. JOHN B. MACDONALD was a member. Also in October, Prof. Sheffield became chairman (part-time) of the newly established Prince Edward Island Commission on Post-Secondary Education.

PROFS. ROBIN S. HARRIS, Macdonald and Sheffield and Mr. Hansen initiated an informal meeting of persons interested in higher education as a field of study and research, which took place in Ottawa, Nov. 4, on the eve of the AUCC annual meeting. The possibility of forming a Canadian society for the study of higher education and publishing a journal of higher education was discussed.

Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies

PROF. ARMAND MAURER gave two lectures entitled "Truth and Temporality" and "Religious Language" at the Catholic University of America, Washington, on Oct. 23 and 24.

The United Appeal

President Claude Bissell has received the following letter of appreciation from L. G. Rector, 1969 campaign chairman, United Appeal for Metropolitan Toronto:

"Appropriately thanking all who contributed to the achievement of our recent successful campaign is one of my pleasant tasks. It is, of course, impossible to thank everyone and I would hope, therefore, that you will be able to publish this letter so that your campaign team, under the able leadership of Alex Rankin and Dean Jim Ham, and the entire staff may know of our appreciation for their generous efforts. The result of more than \$130,000 is amongst the largest dollar increase of any employee group in the Metro area this year. Congratulations!

"On behalf of our 42,000 campaign volunteers and the 75 member agencies, I wish to express sincere thanks."

Graduate Council discusses equivalence of overseas degrees

(Continued from page 7)

some discussion of whether it was necessary to study, in a more formal way, the question of what constitutes a minimum satisfactory level of Canadian student participation in graduate work. It was suggested that a committee might be set up to study all available relevant data and to propose policy guidelines. It was, however, agreed that such a committee would need to refer to the results of the second provincial Survey of Nationality, to be carried out by the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies on the basis of enrolment as at December 1, 1969. Since that report is not expected before late January or February, 1970, consideration of the question has, for the time being, been deferred.

iii. 603 graduate degrees will be given at the December 1969 Convocation compared to 625 last fall. The small decrease in the total is more than accounted for by a reorganization in Social Work, and is compensated by a sharp increase in the number of Ph.D.'s—129, compared to 87 last fall.

iv. Recent clarification of government regulations relating to the counting of graduate students has allowed the School to return to its earlier practice whereby enrolment in the previous regular session enables a candidate to proceed to the degree at the Fall Convocation without further fee (although registration without payment is still required). Arrangements have been made to reimburse students in these circumstances who, under the Board ruling of May, 1968, paid the re-registration fee this session.

Reports of Divisions

The Executive Committees of the four divisions, after discussing the equivalence of certain qualifications from overseas, reached the following conclusions:

Indian and Pakistani Degrees: Divisions I, III, and IV propose to require for admission a first-class Master's degree from Indian or Pakistani universities. Division I proposes to accept such students into a 2-year Master's program; Divisions III and IV prefer the length of the program to be based on the merits of the individual applicant. Division II declined to propose a general ruling, and recommends the establishment of a decanal committee whose members are suitably qualified to judge such applications. All four committees stress the need for careful individual assessments.

UK Universities—Lower Second-Class Standing: Divisions I, III and IV would be prepared to regard a lower second-class standing granted by a university in the UK to be equivalent to minimum admission requirements to the School of Graduate Studies, but emphasize that the department must be responsible for individual recommendations. Division II does not recognize such equivalence, but would be prepared to consider the candidates on specific recommendation by a department.

Degrees Awarded by the UK Council for National Academic Awards: The Executive Committees found it difficult to express an opinion on the merits of

these degrees, since there is little available information about them. Division III recommends acceptance of such qualifications at the Honors level, so that experience may be gained of the performance of these graduates. Division IV recommends careful scrutiny of the qualifications before candidates holding them are accepted for admission. Divisions I and II expressed no opinion.

The general meeting of Division II had asked the Executive Committee to decide whether a second meeting of the division to discuss the CUG Report should be called. Consideration of this has been deferred until after the December 9 Special Meeting of Council to discuss this report.

The Associate Dean of Division III reported on a recent visit by delegates from the Universidad Técnica del Estado, Chile. He described their plans to mount their own graduate programs in Mathematics, Physics, and Chemistry, and their hope that faculty members from Toronto would be willing to work with them in developing this enterprise. This cooperative effort to improve education in Chile has the support of the Canadian International Development Agency.

Other Business

The President of the Graduate Students' Union announced that Professors Mathews and Steele of Carleton University had been invited to speak in Convocation Hall on Nov. 28, from 1 to 3 p.m. Members of the graduate faculty were invited to attend.

Opportunity to enrol in Extended Health Plan

Staff members who did not enrol for coverage in the University's Blue Cross Extended Health Care Plan for coverage effective November 1, 1969, now have another opportunity to enrol for coverage effective March 1, 1970.

This date represents the effective date of coverage and all applications must be received in the Staff Relations Department, Personnel Office, before January 30, 1970.

Information and applications are available from the Staff Relations Department (928-2015). Those staff members who do not enrol before the 30th of January will not have another opportunity of joining this plan until February 1971.

Have you a house to rent?

The Housing Service has already received enquiries concerning furnished houses or apartments to let during the summer months, and for houses available for the next academic year.

If there are faculty or staff members interested in renting their houses for either the summer months or for Sabbatical leave period, please write or phone the Housing Service, 49 St. George Street. Telephone 928-2542.

STAFF NOTES

(Continued from page 7)

Social Work

DR. ELIZABETH GOVAN summarized reports of discussion groups at the Workshop on Poverty in Peel County, organized by Peel Community Services, Brampton, Oct. 18.

MISS ELSPETH LATIMER presented a paper on Sept. 20 to a Board-Committee Workshop of the Toronto Branch, Ontario Association of Professional Social Workers, on "Changing Society—Changing Profession?"

DR. B. SCHLESINGER was reappointed a member of the Vanier Institute of the Family; was appointed to the advisory boards of OTENA (Family Life and Sex Education Information Service, Ottawa), and the journals *Marriage and Family Coordinator*.

DR. BEN SHAPIRO was appointed to a committee of the United Jewish Welfare Fund to examine its program of Scholarships-in-Aid.

Business

PROF. J. H. G. CRISPO has been elected to the Board of the Industrial Relations Research Association for a three year term. Prof. Crispo addressed the British Columbia Government Employees' Union Convention in Prince George, B.C. on Oct. 3 on the subject of "Collective Bargaining and the

Public Service". He also participated in a seminar on "Construction Labour Relations" at the monthly dinner meeting of the Personnel Association of Toronto on Oct. 14.

PROF. W. R. WATERS participated in the National Industrial Conference Board's business outlook conference held in Toronto, Oct. 23. His address was entitled "Financing Consumer Expenditures in the 1970's".

Music

PROF. JOHN BECKWITH's *The Sun Dance* for narrator, six solo singers, chorus, four sub-choruses, organ, and percussion, received its first performance on Oct. 26 by the choirs of St. George's United Church, which commissioned it. LLOYD BRADSHAW conducted, and the organist was GEORGE BROUCH.

PROF. JOHN WEINZWEIG's *Divertimento No. 4 for Clarinet and Strings* was performed at the National Arts Centre on Nov. 4. *Dummiyah (Silence)* received its radio premiere on CBC, Nov. 18. Both works were conducted by VICTOR FELDBRILL.

Graduate Studies

Higher Education

B. L. HANSEN was a member of the Commission discussing "University Planning" at the annual meeting of the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada in Ottawa, Nov. 5.

PROF. EDWARD F. SHEFFIELD was chair-